

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate heard tributes to the late Senator Bridges.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 279-306

Bills Introduced: 12 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced as follows: S. 2690-2703; S.J. Res. 147; and S. Res. 147; and S. Res. 252-254.

Page 281

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 157, changing the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif." (S. Rept. 1120); and

S. Res. 243, authorizing \$125,000 for expenses by the Committee on Public Works for this session of Congress (S. Rept. 1121); referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Page 280

Resolution Rereferred: Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 249, providing \$125,000 as additional funds for Committee on Small Business. The resolution was then rereferred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Page 282

President's Economic Report: Secretary of Senate was authorized to receive on Saturday, January 20, the President's message on the economic report.

Page 279

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that following disposition of H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont), the Senate will take up S. 2520, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to method of enforcement, to be followed by S. 1241, College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act. He also stated that in the near future the Senate will consider S. 1633, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; S. 404, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; S. 1380, relating to death penalty in the D.C.; and S. 349, "cold war GI bill."

Page 280

Senator Bridges: Senate adopted S. Res. 254, providing that the business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of receiving tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator Bridges. Pursuant to the terms of the resolution action was suspended for today on H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont), and numerous Senators delivered tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator Bridges.

Pages 314-340

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:07 p.m. until noon Thursday, January 18, when it will continue on H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont).

Page 340

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce: The Textile Subcommittee continued its hearings to review progress of the administration's efforts to aid the textile industry, and to update the subcommittee's information on the industry, having as its witnesses Gov. Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire, and Noel Hemmendinger, U.S.-Japan Trade Council. Several written statements were submitted for inclusion in the record.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

CONGO STUDY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs met in executive session to discuss plans for its hearings to begin tomorrow concerning the role of the U.N. and the U.S. in the Congo during the past several months. Tomorrow's hearings will be held in executive session to receive testimony from Secretary Rusk and other State Department officials.

D13

D14

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 18, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

D.C. REDEVELOPMENT

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee No. 1 met in executive session to consider H.R. 6312, to amend the D.C. Redevelopment Act. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

Committee on Education and Labor: Special Subcommittee on Labor continued hearings on proposed Federal equal employment opportunity legislation. Heard testimony from G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; and a public witness. Hearings continue Thursday, January 18.

WORLD SITUATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Met in executive session for a briefing by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the present world situation.

GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Ordered reported to the House S. 383 (amended), to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park.

WESTERN RECLAMATION

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation heard the directors of the National Reclamation Association discuss the western reclamation program. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization met in executive session to discuss the subcommittee's program for this year.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Science and Astronautics: The committee met in executive session for an organizational meeting. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 18

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, on the nomination of John S. McCone, to be Director of the CIA; Fred H. Korth, to be Secretary of the Navy; and Neil Harlan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, 10:30 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive, on money resolutions for the committee and subcommittees for the coming session, 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on African Affairs, executive hearings, on the role of the U.N. and the U.S. in the Congo during the past several months, to hear Secretary Rusk, and other State Department officials, 9:45 a.m., room F-53, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to hold its annual meeting with the Board of Directors of the National Reclamation Association, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, executive, on proposed resolutions requesting funds for subcommittees' operations for the coming session, 10:30 a.m., 2300 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Labor, on proposed Federal equal employment opportunity legislation, 9:15 a.m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, executive, briefing by executive branch officials, 10 a.m., G-3 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands, on H.R. 9097, 9115, and 9273, public lands bills, 9:45 a.m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on H.R. 3024, to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, 10 a.m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive, to resume consideration of the President's 1961 tax message, 10 a.m., committee room, New House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, executive, to receive a briefing on U.S. underground nuclear weapons testing, to hear Chairman Seaborg, and other AEC officials, and DOD representatives, 2 p.m., room AE-1, Capitol.

Now, again, people may agree that something needs to be done, but they might have an honest disagreement about some of the details of what should be done. That isn't fatal to a bill.

Question. On the question of medical care for the aged, do you favor placing it under social security?

Answer. Yes, I've always been in favor of it.

Question. What's your judgment about the chances—

Answer. If the bill is reported out of committee, I feel that we will get it through the House. The difficult task will be in having a bill reported out of committee.

WAYS TO HELP SCHOOLS

Question. How about your view on aid to schools, including parochial schools and private schools?

Answer. Parochial schools are private schools. I always refer to private schools, because there are private schools that are not church-related—though it is true that most of them are church-related, I will agree. Do you want my position on school legislation?

Question. Yes—

Answer. I've always supported school-construction legislation.

My position on school legislation is very simple. I respect the fact that people may not agree with me and I respect their right to their views and their right to disagree. But I expect others to respect the fact that I have the right to my views.

To begin with, I've always supported school legislation, and you'll find that, whenever the vote came, I voted for it. And you'll find that I spoke for aid to schools in the past years. I believe that we should strengthen our whole educational system.

I'm talking now about elementary and secondary schools. I realize we can't legislate for private schools on the same basis that we can for public schools. But I do believe that we can strengthen our overall school system, including private schools.

I support the general bill for school aid. But I also believe that, in the best interests of our country—certainly in strengthening the overall elementary- and secondary-school system—there should be provisions for long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to private schools for the building of classroom facilities: (1) to teach science, (2) to teach mathematics, and (3) to teach languages.

I don't know how anybody can say that that's inconsistent with the Constitution, and I don't see how anybody can, in this day and age, disagree. But people do. They have a right to their views.

I also believe in the 50 percent forgiveness for those who have received Government loans to finish their college education and to enter the career of teaching. When they teach in public schools, they are given, as you know, 50 percent forgiveness of the loan over a 5-year period. This should be extended to private schools.

Private schools have a demand for teachers. This is an unintentional discrimination against the private schools, when graduates of colleges who wish to make teaching a career in private schools are denied the same privilege of loan forgiveness given to teachers in public schools. I imagine it makes it more difficult for the private-school system to get the young-men and young-women teachers.

That's been my position. However, suppose a bill were reported out of committee without any provision for private schools—what would I do? I would vote for it. I am quoted as saying I'd vote against such a bill. All anyone had to do was to ask me. My views are entirely different than they have been portrayed.

Question. Are you and the President in disagreement on some phases of aid to education?

Answer. I couldn't answer that question.

I don't know definitely what are the President's views with reference to my views relating to private schools. I'm for the general education bill—have always been, through the years—every rollcall will find me voting for it.

However, I believe that long-term loans to private schools for the purposes I have stated would be for the best interest of our country. I think it would be unfortunate not to encourage the almost 6 million young Americans attending private schools to study to be scientists, physicists, mathematicians, learned in the languages.

Question. Do you think that aid to education is going to be approved in this session?

Answer. Of course, without the question of private schools involved, such legislation has been defeated in the past. And, without the question of teachers' salaries involved, legislation has been defeated in the past. It's only a few years ago that, on the final passage in the House, a bill confined, as I remember, to school construction was defeated by five votes. It was almost the same bill that former President Eisenhower had recommended a year or so before. But there was a change in the climate of the administration between the recommendation and the time the bill came up for vote. The result was that it was defeated by five votes, and we didn't get many Republican votes for it.

Question. And was that limited to public schools?

Answer. That was confined to public schools, yes. So if we have a straight school-construction bill, it's going to have a hard job getting approval. We brought up an abbreviated bill the last session, and it was defeated by a very substantial margin. I voted for it.

Question. Would you care to predict what will happen this time?

Answer. No, I couldn't. I would say this: that I favor a bill with provisions for loans to private schools. If we get a bill up for vote and the provisions for aid to private schools are not in it, or if they are in and the House votes to strike them out, I'd vote for the bill just the same.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Question. It sometimes is said that, as a Roman Catholic, your attitude toward aid to education has been influenced by the church. Could you discuss that?

Answer. There has never been any member of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church that has ever discussed the subject with me.

You know, the strange thing to me is to read in the paper about so-and-so as a Member of Congress and a Catholic. You never hear anybody mentioned as a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, or a Baptist, or any other religion, and that is correct. My views are my own independent views. Nobody has ever even spoken to me.

I have felt for many years that long-term loans for certain purposes, for private schools, were proper. As a matter of fact, you could go much further. You could have specific grants.

Nobody talks about the constitutionality of long-term loans for college dormitory purposes, or about aiding private colleges, yet the same basic constitutional questions are involved.

We have long-term loans now for equipment—purchase of equipment—in private schools for those purposes, already in the law. Mine is just a step further through the building of classroom facilities for the purposes I have heretofore stated. There are many aspects of this question. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest educational bills we have is the one I introduced—the Donable Property Act. Schools, colleges, as well as hospitals, are the beneficiary of all this surplus property that the Government has.

Last year there was an acquisition value in this property of about \$400 million—just last year, alone. Since the bill became law,

the hospitals and schools of the country have got probably \$4 to \$5 billion acquisition value in usable items. And I am the author of the bill. They all benefit.

So—from the angle of effect on education and hospitals, the Donable Property Act is a matter of great significance and importance. And, since it's been mentioned, I will just tell you that I resort with all the vigor at my command these references to my religion influencing my attitude on public questions.

Question. Some people say that your party tends to be one of big spenders. Is an effort to be made to curtail spending in this session?

Answer. Of course, the accusation is not supported by the facts. The Democratic Party is one of great builders. I could make a campaign speech in response to that question, but it would be inappropriate on this occasion.

Of course, the cost of Government is increasing and in all governments—Federal, State, and local—there are factors that we're all acquainted with. But I know what you mean—you mean unnecessary expenditures.

The increased expenditures last year—a little over \$6 billion, as you will remember—were for national defense. I think the American people will support any recommendation that the President felt was necessary for the defense of our country. I'd even go further: I think they would be willing to make sacrifices by accepting additional taxes if necessary for greater national defense.

COALITIONS IN HOUSE

Question. Coming back to the House of Representatives: Is there such a thing as a real working coalition in the House—a conservative coalition?

Answer. I cannot answer that question, because that presupposes a definite organization. I've heard it charged, but I couldn't say, on the evidence I've had, that it is so.

Question. Well, would you say that, to the same extent there might be a conservative coalition, there is also a liberal coalition?

Answer. On all important legislation of a progressive nature—recognizing that there might be honest differences of opinion—every effort is made to try to attract the progressive-minded Members in both parties to support progressive legislation that is before the House.

Question. Conservative grouping is a little bit more formal than the liberal grouping, is it not?

Answer. You're the one who made that statement, and you'd have to give me evidence. I see no evidence upon which I could make a finding that there is a formal organization.

Question. Do you favor an increase in the size of the House?

Answer. I favor an increase.

Question. How many members would you favor adding?

Answer. The House membership in this Congress will be 435. The increase suggested is either to 451 or 438 or 439. The 438 is by reason of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska.

Three States lost Congressmen because of admission to the Union of Alaska and Hawaii, and I strongly favored the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. Massachusetts is one of those suffering loss of a seat in the House as a result. And so it seems to me there's a clear case for increasing House membership to this extent.

There's some logic to the argument that, to keep the House odd-numbered, membership should be 439 rather than 438. You can't ignore the logic of that argument. So any reasonable bill that the committee reported out is one that I would support, even if more than three or four.

Question. Isn't it going to be a little hard to hold the House, though, on any fixed number of new Members, once you open up the subject?

Answer. That's one of the imponderables that confronted us last year, and you can't really answer that until the matter comes before the House. No one could give a definite answer before action by the House.

Question. Complaints are heard that the House membership is out of balance; that is to say, it gives too much weight to the viewpoints of the rural areas and the small towns and small cities and not enough to the viewpoints of the big cities. Would you agree with that?

Answer. No; not today—not for some past years. There might have been something to that when I first came to Congress, but, no; I could not agree to that now—otherwise, you wouldn't have had housing legislation, minimum wage, so many progressive bills that are of primary interest to the urban districts, particularly cities. You wouldn't have them enacted into law if that was so. I think that's the answer.

REFLECTING PUBLIC WISHES

Question. Would you say that a Member of the House tends to be closer to the people than either a Senator or the President, inasmuch as House Members stand for reelection every 2 years?

Answer. I don't think either branch is closer to the people than the President. The President is a symbol of all the hopes and aspirations of our people.

As between the two branches, the Senate now, of course—as a result of direct election and, in most States, direct nomination—is certainly close to the people. But, having that in mind, I don't think the Senators, as close to the people as they are, are as close as the Members of the House, because they cover a State and we represent a congressional district. And, by reason of that service to a district, we can keep closer—and the people know their Congressman pretty well, where they might not know the Senator.

Question. A Member of the House, because he's elected every 2 years, has a chance to get close more often than a Member of the Senate—

Answer. I think the House Member would be closer even if there were 4-year terms.

Question. You've been in Congress a long time. Has it been your observation over the years that Members, by and large, tend to reflect what they conceive to be the majority view of the people of their own district?

Answer. I would think most Members view things from a national angle. My experience teaches me that. Take my own case: I've always supported farm legislation. I come from Boston, where there isn't a farm in my district. But there's a problem in agriculture. I've always supported farm legislation, because I realize the great importance of agriculture to our national economy.

I've always voted, also, for projects to develop our natural resources and to protect against floods, etc.

Just because these projects are not located in New England is no reason why I should vote against them. I don't know why I should vote against a great project out West or down South or anywhere else if it benefits our country.

Making Sure About the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider

the nomination of John A. McCone to be the new head of the Central Intelligence Agency. A hearing on the nomination is scheduled for January 18.

Because I believe this post is one of the most important in our Government, concerned as it is with the information on which our policy decisions may be based, I have taken a great deal of interest in this nomination. The Senator from Minnesota, EUGENE MCCARTHY, has also been deeply interested in the qualifications and background of the nominee and plans to testify.

I feel that Senator MCCARTHY is doing a most useful and necessary job in studying the circumstances surrounding this nomination and in bringing the facts into full consideration. It is one of the problems uniquely arising here that the qualifications and attitudes of the Director of Central Intelligence may be examined only the one time—at a hearing upon his qualifications—and the work his Agency does, is subjected thereafter to no regular congressional surveillance.

Tribute has been paid to the work which Senator MCCARTHY has done in an editorial which appeared on January 14 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I offer this editorial for the RECORD as I believe it underlines the importance of this hearing.

I would make one statement, however, regarding a conclusion drawn in the editorial. It states that Mr. McCone should be questioned whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. Congress has already entrusted authority to the Director of Central Intelligence to carry out any assignments given him by the National Security Council. He is precluded from taking any steps not authorized by the President of the United States. Yet there remains excellent reason why Congress should exercise surveillance over the policies and organization of the Agency it established in 1947 and gave such tremendous power.

The article follows:

MAKING SURE ABOUT THE CIA

Extraordinary is the only word for the Powers of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Conceivably, he might involve the United States in war. Short of that extreme, the Agency is engaged not only in the search for information by espionage and any other means it deems suitable, but possibly also in political intrigues in many parts of the world. All this without the clear knowledge of Congress. Even the CIA budget, obviously big, is a guarded secret.

Especially since the tragic fiasco of the Cuban invasion, the risks involved in its activities have engendered a desire for greater assurance about the work of the CIA. Since the Government may make perilous decisions on the Agency's say-so, its head—at the least—should be one of the most mature, objective, and responsible men in Washington.

John A. McCone, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, was named to the post by President Kennedy after Congress adjourned. Now that it is again in session, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, says that he will oppose confirmation. This may not please the White House and it may offend some men on Capitol Hill, but the quietly competent Senator

from Minnesota is conscientiously doing his duty.

Objections to Mr. McCone have been raised on his record. It is a question whether these are disqualifying. Yet it would be a dereliction of congressional responsibility if such matters were not looked into. As Senator MCCARTHY has indicated, the investigation also should go into policies established by Mr. McCone for the CIA—especially whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. In insisting on a review of Mr. McCone's qualifications, Senator MCCARTHY serves his country well.

Opposition by Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc., to Controls on Turkeys and Broilers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. James H. Baxter, Jr., president of the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc.

In this letter Mr. Baxter calls attention to the fact that the Delaware Farm Bureau has unanimously passed a resolution opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,

Dover, Del., January 5, 1962.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our board meeting on Tuesday, January 2, we discussed our position on production controls, and we thought it best that we bring you up to date with our policy on volume controls on turkeys and poultry.

At the annual meeting of the Sussex County Farm Bureau membership it was unanimously passed that they go on record opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

This same resolution was placed before the voting delegates at our State convention and was also unanimously approved.

Our State policy was then sent to the American Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago and the following policy was approved:

Volume controls: "We oppose the use of any legislation on administrative controls to restrict the total volume of production on marketing of livestock, turkeys, poultry, or any other agricultural commodity not now under control."

We feel that this information is very significant at this time because of the fact of the proposed turkey referendum and the proposed legislation in the Senate to place poultry in line for Government controls.

So, therefore, we hope that you will vote against any such proposal and that you will use your influence on others to do likewise.

With the best wishes for a happy new year for 1962.

Very truly,

JAMES H. BAXTER, JR.,
President.

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate heard tributes to the late Senator Bridges.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 279-306

Bills Introduced: 12 bills and 4 resolutions were introduced as follows: S. 2690-2703; S.J. Res. 147; and S. Res. 147; and S. Res. 252-254.

Page 281

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 157, changing the name of the Playa del Rey Inlet and Harbor, Venice, Calif., to the "Marina del Rey, Los Angeles, Calif." (S. Rept. 1120); and

S. Res. 243, authorizing \$125,000 for expenses by the Committee on Public Works for this session of Congress (S. Rept. 1121); referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Page 280

Resolution Rereferred: Committee on Banking and Currency was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 249, providing \$125,000 as additional funds for Committee on Small Business. The resolution was then rereferred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

Page 282

President's Economic Report: Secretary of Senate was authorized to receive on Saturday, January 20, the President's message on the economic report.

Page 279

Legislative Program: Majority leader announced that following disposition of H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont), the Senate will take up S. 2520, to amend the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act with regard to method of enforcement, to be followed by S. 1241, College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act. He also stated that in the near future the Senate will consider S. 1633, to establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing; S. 404, to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; S. 1380, relating to death penalty in the D.C.; and S. 349, "cold war GI bill."

Page 280

Senator Bridges: Senate adopted S. Res. 254, providing that the business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of receiving tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator Bridges. Pursuant to the terms of the resolution action was suspended for today on H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont), and numerous Senators delivered tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Senator Bridges.

Pages 314-340

Program for Thursday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 6:07 p.m. until noon Thursday, January 18, when it will continue on H.R. 8847, stock distribution (Du Pont).

Page 340

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Committee on Commerce: The Textile Subcommittee continued its hearings to review progress of the administration's efforts to aid the textile industry, and to update the subcommittee's information on the industry, having as its witnesses Gov. Wesley Powell, of New Hampshire, and Noel Hemmendinger, U.S.-Japan Trade Council. Several written statements were submitted for inclusion in the record.

Subcommittee recessed subject to call.

CONGO STUDY

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on African Affairs met in executive session to discuss plans for its hearings to begin tomorrow concerning the role of the U.N. and the U.S. in the Congo during the past several months. Tomorrow's hearings will be held in executive session to receive testimony from Secretary Rusk and other State Department officials.

D13

D14

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, January 18, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

D.C. REDEVELOPMENT

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee No. 1 met in executive session to consider H.R. 6312, to amend the D.C. Redevelopment Act. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

Committee on Education and Labor: Special Subcommittee on Labor continued hearings on proposed Federal equal employment opportunity legislation. Heard testimony from G. Mennen Williams, Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs; and a public witness. Hearings continue Thursday, January 18.

WORLD SITUATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Met in executive session for a briefing by Secretary of State Dean Rusk on the present world situation.

GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Ordered reported to the House S. 383 (amended), to provide for the acquisition of a patented mining claim on the south rim of Grand Canyon National Park.

WESTERN RECLAMATION

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation heard the directors of the National Reclamation Association discuss the western reclamation program. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

MANPOWER UTILIZATION

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service: Subcommittee on Manpower Utilization met in executive session to discuss the subcommittee's program for this year.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Science and Astronautics: The committee met in executive session for an organizational meeting. Adjourned subject to call of the Chair.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, JANUARY 18

(All meetings are open unless otherwise designated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services, on the nomination of John S. McCone, to be Director of the CIA; Fred H. Korth, to be Secretary of the Navy; and Neil Harlan, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, 10:30 a.m., 212 Old Senate Office Building.

Committee on Banking and Currency, executive, on money resolutions for the committee and subcommittees for the coming session, 10 a.m., 5302 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Relations, Subcommittee on African Affairs, executive hearings, on the role of the U.N. and the U.S. in the Congo during the past several months, to hear Secretary Rusk, and other State Department officials, 9:45 a.m., room F-53, Capitol.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to hold its annual meeting with the Board of Directors of the National Reclamation Association, 10 a.m., 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Committee on the Judiciary, executive, on proposed resolutions requesting funds for subcommittees' operations for the coming session, 10:30 a.m., 2300 New Senate Office Building.

House

Committee on Education and Labor, Special Subcommittee on Labor, on proposed Federal equal employment opportunity legislation, 9:15 a.m., 429 Old House Office Building.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, executive, briefing by executive branch officials, 10 a.m., G-3 U.S. Capitol Building.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Subcommittee on Public Lands, on H.R. 9097, 9115, and 9273, public lands bills, 9:45 a.m., 1324 New House Office Building.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, on H.R. 3024, to prohibit the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, 10 a.m., 1334 New House Office Building.

Committee on Ways and Means, executive, to resume consideration of the President's 1961 tax message, 10 a.m., committee room, New House Office Building.

Joint Committee

Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, executive, to receive a briefing on U.S. underground nuclear weapons testing, to hear Chairman Seaborg, and other AEC officials, and DOD representatives, 2 p.m., room AE-1, Capitol.

Now, again, people may agree that something needs to be done, but they might have an honest disagreement about some of the details of what should be done. That isn't fatal to a bill.

Question. On the question of medical care for the aged, do you favor placing it under social security?

Answer. Yes, I've always been in favor of it.

Question. What's your judgment about the chances—

Answer. If the bill is reported out of committee, I feel that we will get it through the House. The difficult task will be in having a bill reported out of committee.

WAYS TO HELP SCHOOLS

Question. How about your view on aid to schools, including parochial schools and private schools?

Answer. Parochial schools are private schools. I always refer to private schools, because there are private schools that are not church-related—though it is true that most of them are church-related, I will agree. Do you want my position on school legislation?

Question. Yes—

Answer. I've always supported school-construction legislation.

My position on school legislation is very simple. I respect the fact that people may not agree with me and I respect their right to their views and their right to disagree. But I expect others to respect the fact that I have the right to my views.

To begin with, I've always supported school legislation, and you'll find that, whenever the vote came, I voted for it. And you'll find that I spoke for aid to schools in the past years. I believe that we should strengthen our whole educational system.

I'm talking now about elementary and secondary schools. I realize we can't legislate for private schools on the same basis that we can for public schools. But I do believe that we can strengthen our overall school system, including private schools.

I support the general bill for school aid. But I also believe that, in the best interests of our country—certainly in strengthening the overall elementary- and secondary-school system—there should be provisions for long-term loans at reasonable rates of interest to private schools for the building of classroom facilities: (1) to teach science, (2) to teach mathematics, and (3) to teach languages.

I don't know how anybody can say that that's inconsistent with the Constitution, and I don't see how anybody can, in this day and age, disagree. But people do. They have a right to their views.

I also believe in the 50 percent forgiveness for those who have received Government loans to finish their college education and to enter the career of teaching. When they teach in public schools, they are given, as you know, 50 percent forgiveness of the loan over a 5-year period. This should be extended to private schools.

Private schools have a demand for teachers. This is an unintentional discrimination against the private schools, when graduates of colleges who wish to make teaching a career in private schools are denied the same privilege of loan forgiveness given to teachers in public schools. I imagine it makes it more difficult for the private-school system to get the young-men and young-women teachers.

That's been my position. However, suppose a bill were reported out of committee without any provision for private schools—what would I do? I would vote for it. I am quoted as saying I'd vote against such a bill. All anyone had to do was to ask me. My views are entirely different than they have been portrayed.

Question. Are you and the President in disagreement on some phases of aid to education?

Answer. I couldn't answer that question.

I don't know definitely what are the President's views with reference to my views relating to private schools. I'm for the general education bill—have always been, through the years—every rollcall will find me voting for it.

However, I believe that long-term loans to private schools for the purposes I have stated would be for the best interest of our country. I think it would be unfortunate not to encourage the almost 6 million young Americans attending private schools to study to be scientists, physicists, mathematicians, learned in the languages.

Question. Do you think that aid to education is going to be approved in this session?

Answer. Of course, without the question of private schools involved, such legislation has been defeated in the past. And, without the question of teachers' salaries involved, legislation has been defeated in the past. It's only a few years ago that, on the final passage in the House, a bill confined, as I remember, to school construction was defeated by five votes. It was almost the same bill that former President Eisenhower had recommended a year or so before. But there was a change in the climate of the administration between the recommendation and the time the bill came up for vote. The result was that it was defeated by five votes, and we didn't get many Republican votes for it.

Question. And was that limited to public schools?

Answer. That was confined to public schools, yes. So if we have a straight school-construction bill, it's going to have a hard job getting approval. We brought up an abbreviated bill the last session, and it was defeated by a very substantial margin. I voted for it.

Question. Would you care to predict what will happen this time?

Answer. No, I couldn't. I would say this: that I favor a bill with provisions for loans to private schools. If we get a bill up for vote and the provisions for aid to private schools are not in it, or if they are in and the House votes to strike them out, I'd vote for the bill just the same.

THE CHURCH AND EDUCATION

Question. It sometimes is said that, as a Roman Catholic, your attitude toward aid to education has been influenced by the church. Could you discuss that?

Answer. There has never been any member of the hierarchy of the Catholic Church that has ever discussed the subject with me.

You know, the strange thing to me is to read in the paper about so-and-so as a Member of Congress and a Catholic. You never hear anybody mentioned as a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, or a Baptist, or any other religion, and that is correct. My views are my own independent views. Nobody has ever even spoken to me.

I have felt for many years that long-term loans for certain purposes, for private schools, were proper. As a matter of fact, you could go much further. You could have specific grants.

Nobody talks about the constitutionality of long-term loans for college dormitory purposes, or about aiding private colleges, yet the same basic constitutional questions are involved.

We have long-term loans now for equipment—purchase of equipment—in private schools for those purposes, already in the law. Mine is just a step further through the building of classroom facilities for the purposes I have heretofore stated. There are many aspects of this question. As a matter of fact, one of the greatest educational bills we have is the one I introduced—the Donable Property Act. Schools, colleges, as well as hospitals, are the beneficiary of all this surplus property that the Government has.

Last year there was an acquisition value in this property of about \$400 million—just last year, alone. Since the bill became law,

the hospitals and schools of the country have got probably \$4 to \$5 billion acquisition value in usable items. And I am the author of the bill. They all benefit.

So—from the angle of effect on education and hospitals, the Donable Property Act is a matter of great significance and importance. And, since it's been mentioned, I will just tell you that I resent with all the vigor at my command these references to my religion influencing my attitude on public questions.

Question. Some people say that your party tends to be one of big spenders. Is an effort to be made to curtail spending in this session?

Answer. Of course, the accusation is not supported by the facts. The Democratic Party is one of great builders. I could make a campaign speech in response to that question, but it would be inappropriate on this occasion.

Of course, the cost of Government is increasing and in all governments—Federal, State, and local—there are factors that we're all acquainted with. But I know what you mean—you mean unnecessary expenditures.

The increased expenditures last year—a little over \$6 billion, as you will remember—were for national defense. I think the American people will support any recommendation that the President felt was necessary for the defense of our country. I'd even go further: I think they would be willing to make sacrifices by accepting additional taxes if necessary for greater national defense.

COALITIONS IN HOUSE

Question. Coming back to the House of Representatives: Is there such a thing as a real working coalition in the House—a conservative coalition?

Answer. I cannot answer that question, because that presupposes a definite organization. I've heard it charged, but I couldn't say, on the evidence I've had, that it is so.

Question. Well, would you say that, to the same extent there might be a conservative coalition, there is also a liberal coalition?

Answer. On all important legislation of a progressive nature—recognizing that there might be honest differences of opinion—every effort is made to try to attract the progressive-minded Members in both parties to support progressive legislation that is before the House.

Question. Conservative grouping is a little bit more formal than the liberal grouping, is it not?

Answer. You're the one who made that statement, and you'd have to give me evidence. I see no evidence upon which I could make a finding that there is a formal organization.

Question. Do you favor an increase in the size of the House?

Answer. I favor an increase.

Question. How many members would you favor adding?

Answer. The House membership in this Congress will be 435. The increase suggested is either to 451 or 438 or 439. The 438 is by reason of the admission of Hawaii and Alaska.

Three States lost Congressmen because of admission to the Union of Alaska and Hawaii, and I strongly favored the admission of Hawaii and Alaska. Massachusetts is one of those suffering loss of a seat in the House as a result. And so it seems to me there's a clear case for increasing House membership to this extent.

There's some logic to the argument that, to keep the House odd-numbered, membership should be 439 rather than 438. You can't ignore the logic of that argument. So any reasonable bill that the committee reported out is one that I would support, even if more than three or four.

Question. Isn't it going to be a little hard to hold the House, though, on any fixed number of new Members, once you open up the subject?

Answer. That's one of the imponderables that confronted us last year, and you can't really answer that until the matter comes before the House. No one could give a definite answer before action by the House.

Question. Complaints are heard that the House membership is out of balance; that is to say, it gives too much weight to the viewpoints of the rural areas and the small towns and small cities and not enough to the viewpoints of the big cities. Would you agree with that?

Answer. No; not today—not for some past years. There might have been something to that when I first came to Congress, but, no; I could not agree to that now—otherwise, you wouldn't have had housing legislation, minimum wage, so many progressive bills that are of primary interest to the urban districts, particularly cities. You wouldn't have them enacted into law if that was so. I think that's the answer.

REFLECTING PUBLIC WISHES

Question. Would you say that a Member of the House tends to be closer to the people than either a Senator or the President, inasmuch as House Members stand for reelection every 2 years?

Answer. I don't think either branch is closer to the people than the President. The President is a symbol of all the hopes and aspirations of our people.

As between the two branches, the Senate now, of course—as a result of direct election and, in most States, direct nomination—is certainly close to the people. But, having that in mind, I don't think the Senators, as close to the people as they are, are as close as the Members of the House, because they cover a State and we represent a congressional district. And, by reason of that service to a district, we can keep closer—and the people know their Congressman pretty well, where they might not know the Senator.

Question. A Member of the House, because he's elected every 2 years, has a chance to get close more often than a Member of the Senate—

Answer. I think the House Member would be closer even if there were 4-year terms.

Question. You've been in Congress a long time. Has it been your observation over the years that Members, by and large, tend to reflect what they conceive to be the majority view of the people of their own district?

Answer. I would think most Members view things from a national angle. My experience teaches me that. Take my own case: I've always supported farm legislation. I come from Boston, where there isn't a farm in my district. But there's a problem in agriculture. I've always supported farm legislation, because I realize the great importance of agriculture to our national economy.

I've always voted, also, for projects to develop our natural resources and to protect against floods, etc.

Just because these projects are not located in New England is no reason why I should vote against them. I don't know why I should vote against a great project out West or down South or anywhere else if it benefits our country.

Making Sure About the CIA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 15, 1962

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Senate will shortly be asked to consider

the nomination of John A. McCone to be the new head of the Central Intelligence Agency. A hearing on the nomination is scheduled for January 18.

Because I believe this post is one of the most important in our Government, concerned as it is with the information on which our policy decisions may be based, I have taken a great deal of interest in this nomination. The Senator from Minnesota, EUGENE MCCARTHY, has also been deeply interested in the qualifications and background of the nominee and plans to testify.

I feel that Senator MCCARTHY is doing a most useful and necessary job in studying the circumstances surrounding this nomination and in bringing the facts into full consideration. It is one of the problems uniquely arising here that the qualifications and attitudes of the Director of Central Intelligence may be examined only the one time—at a hearing upon his qualifications—and the work his Agency does, is subjected thereafter to no regular congressional surveillance.

Tribute has been paid to the work which Senator MCCARTHY has done in an editorial which appeared on January 14 in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. I offer this editorial for the RECORD as I believe it underlines the importance of this hearing.

I would make one statement, however, regarding a conclusion drawn in the editorial. It states that Mr. McCone should be questioned whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. Congress has already entrusted authority to the Director of Central Intelligence to carry out any assignments given him by the National Security Council. He is precluded from taking any steps not authorized by the President of the United States. Yet there remains excellent reason why Congress should exercise surveillance over the policies and organization of the Agency it established in 1947 and gave such tremendous power.

The article follows:

MAKING SURE ABOUT THE CIA

Extraordinary is the only word for the Powers of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Conceivably, he might involve the United States in war. Short of that extreme, the Agency is engaged not only in the search for information by espionage and any other means it deems suitable, but possibly also in political intrigues in many parts of the world. All this without the clear knowledge of Congress. Even the CIA budget, obviously big, is a guarded secret.

Especially since the tragic fiasco of the Cuban invasion, the risks involved in its activities have engendered a desire for greater assurance about the work of the CIA. Since the Government may make perilous decisions on the Agency's say-so, its head—at the least—should be one of the most mature, objective, and responsible men in Washington.

John A. McCone, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, was named to the post by President Kennedy after Congress adjourned. Now that it is again in session, Senator EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota, says that he will oppose confirmation. This may not please the White House and it may offend some men on Capitol Hill, but the quietly competent Senator

from Minnesota is conscientiously doing his duty.

Objections to Mr. McCone have been raised on his record. It is a question whether these are disqualifying. Yet it would be a dereliction of congressional responsibility if such matters were not looked into. As Senator MCCARTHY has indicated, the investigation also should go into policies established by Mr. McCone for the CIA—especially whether he believes he has a mandate to use force anywhere in the world, even in violation of U.S. treaty obligations. In insisting on a review of Mr. McCone's qualifications, Senator MCCARTHY serves his country well.

Opposition by Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc., to Controls on Turkeys and Broilers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 17, 1962

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from Mr. James H. Baxter, Jr., president of the Delaware Farm Bureau, Inc.

In this letter Mr. Baxter calls attention to the fact that the Delaware Farm Bureau has unanimously passed a resolution opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DELAWARE FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Dover, Del., January 5, 1962.

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: At our board meeting on Tuesday, January 2, we discussed our position on production controls, and we thought it best that we bring you up to date with our policy on volume controls on turkeys and poultry.

At the annual meeting of the Sussex County Farm Bureau membership it was unanimously passed that they go on record opposing any type of controls on turkeys and broilers.

This same resolution was placed before the voting delegates at our State convention and was also unanimously approved.

Our State policy was then sent to the American Farm Bureau Convention in Chicago and the following policy was approved:

Volume controls: "We oppose the use of any legislation on administrative controls to restrict the total volume of production on marketing of livestock, turkeys, poultry, or any other agricultural commodity not now under control."

We feel that this information is very significant at this time because of the fact of the proposed turkey referendum and the proposed legislation in the Senate to place poultry in line for Government controls.

So, therefore, we hope that you will vote against any such proposal and that you will use your influence on others to do likewise.

With the best wishes for a happy new year for 1962.

Very truly,

JAMES H. BAXTER, Jr.,
President.